

Nucleon Strangeness: Theory

M.J. Ramsey-Musolf

*Department of Physics, University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269 USA*

and

*Institute for Nuclear Theory, University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195 USA*

Abstract. The status of theoretical calculations of the strange quark vector current form factors of the nucleon is reviewed.

The role played by the $q\bar{q}$ sea in the low-energy structure of the nucleon remains a topic of on-going interest in hadron structure theory. Of particular interest is the strange quark component of this sea, since $s\bar{s}$ pairs constitute the lightest pure sea quark degree of freedom in the nucleon. A study of strange quarks therefore entails no ambiguity in separating sea from valence quark effects. Moreover, the mass scale associated with virtual $s\bar{s}$ pair – $m_s \sim \Lambda_{QCD}$ – implies that such pairs live for a sufficiently long time and propagate over sufficiently large distances to produce observable effects when probed explicitly. Such explicit probes of the structure of the $s\bar{s}$ sea are currently underway using lepton-nucleon and lepton-nucleus scattering [1]. These experiments will measure matrix elements of the strange quark currents: $\langle N | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu s | N \rangle$ and $\langle N | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s | N \rangle$. A survey of these experiments will be given in the following talk by E. Beise, so I will not provide any of the details here.

Theoretically, the strange quark sea – and that of virtual $q\bar{q}$ pairs generally – is interesting because it bears on the question: Why does the quark model work so well? Indeed, there exists little convincing evidence for the need to include the sea quarks as an explicit degree of freedom in accounting for the low-energy properties of hadrons. A partial explanation for this situation has been given by Isgur [2], who noted that in the adiabatic approximation, the effect of virtual $q\bar{q}$ pairs is effectively to renormalize the string tension. In the quark model, the latter is determined phenomenologically, rather than via an *ab initio* calculation. Consequently, the effect of $q\bar{q}$ pairs is already included, and no explicit signature of sea quarks appears in the hadronic spectrum. An alternative explanation has been suggested by Kaplan and Manohar [3], who propose that the effect of the quark and gluon sea is to renormalize the current quarks of QCD into the constituent quarks of the quark model. In either case, the presence of the $s\bar{s}$ sea is “hidden” in observables that do not carry the quantum numbers of strangeness. What

makes the lepton probes mentioned above so interesting is that they hope to uncover this “hidden” degree of freedom and provide new insight into the low-energy structure of the $q\bar{q}$ sea.

Ideally, one would like to have some reliable theoretical predictions for the scale and sign of strange quark matrix elements in order to compare with measurements – or, at least, have in hand a useful theoretical framework for interpreting them. In fact, the last several years has witnessed a plethora of theoretical predictions for the form factors which parameterize the strangeness matrix elements. These predictions fall under three general headings: (a) first principles calculations using lattice QCD [4]; (b) hadronic models [5]; (c) effective hadronic [6-8] theory. At present a few results have been obtained from the lattice in the quenched approximation for the strangeness “magnetic moment” and axial charge [4]. However, a refined lattice calculation appears to be a long way off, and even when it is achieved, one may still require other theoretical tools in order to understand the mechanisms responsible for the scale and sign of the lattice results. QCD-inspired hadronic models are an appealing approach, as they generally emphasize a particular hadronic mechanism and provide a mental picture of strange quark dynamics. Nevertheless, the connection between a given model and QCD is not rigorous, and one must ask whether a given model result is adequately reflective of the full range of strong interaction dynamics. The ambiguities associated with hadronic models are reflected in the rather broad range of theoretical predictions for the strange quark form factors.

An alternative approach, which I wish to emphasize in the remainder of this talk, is the use of effective hadronic theory. The most popular recent version of hadronic effective theory is chiral perturbation theory (CHPT). While CHPT has enjoyed considerable success in accounting for a variety of low-energy hadronic properties, it is rather limited in the case of nucleon strangeness [6]. The reason has to do with the symmetry structure of the strangeness currents. Focusing on the vector current, one has

$$\bar{s}\gamma_\mu s = J_\mu^{\text{baryon}} - 2J_\mu^{\text{em}}(I=0) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where J_μ^{baryon} is the baryon number current (an SU(3)-singlet) and $J_\mu^{\text{em}}(I=0)$ is the isoscalar electromagnetic current. The structure in Eq. (1) implies that the “low-energy constants” or chiral counterterms relevant to the strangeness vector current matrix elements cannot be determined from existing data using symmetry. While there exists sufficient data in the electromagnetic sector, there does not exist the corresponding data in the SU(3)-singlet, or baryon number, sector. Hence, the pieces of the chiral counterterms that depend on baryon number are unknown at present. In fact, measurements of strangeness matrix elements effectively determines these SU(3)-singlet counterterms.

An effective hadronic approach which is similar in spirit to CHPT but more fruitful in the case of strangeness is that of dispersion relations (DR's). Like CHPT, which relies on chiral symmetry to relate existing data to the quantities one would like to predict, DR's rely on analaticity and causality to relate existing scattering data to the strangeness form factors. To illustrate, consider the mean square “strangeness radius” of the nucleon, r_s^2 , defined as the slope of the strangeness electric form factor at the photon point. The DR for this quantity is

$$r_s^2 = \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{t_0}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im} G_E^{(s)}(t)}{t^2} \quad , \quad (2)$$

where $t = q^2$ and t_0 is a threshold to be discussed shortly. Various techniques from field theory allow one to relate $\text{Im} G_E^{(s)}(t)$ – called the spectral function – to amplitudes for a nucleon and anti-nucleon to annihilate into appropriate physical states $|n\rangle$ having mass $\sqrt{t_0}$. The lightest such state which can contribute is $|3\pi\rangle$, which model-builders usually neglect because it contains no valence strange quarks.

The lightest state containing valence strange quarks is $|K\bar{K}\rangle$. Its contribution to the spectral function is [7,8]

$$\text{Im} G_E^{(s)}(t)^{K\bar{K}} = \text{Re} \left\{ \left(\frac{\sqrt{t - 4m_K^2}}{8m_N} \right) b_1^{1/2, 1/2}(t) F_K^{(s)}(t)^* \right\} \quad , \quad (3)$$

where $b_1^{1/2, 1/2}$ is the one of the two $N\bar{N} \rightarrow K\bar{K}$ $J = 1$ partial waves and $F_K^{(s)}$ is the kaon strangeness form factor. The former can be determined by performing fits to K^+N scattering and analytically continuing to the kinematic region needed for the integral in Eq. (2). The kaon strangeness form factor can be obtained by applying straightforward flavor rotation arguments to the kaon electromagnetic form factor, which is known from e^+e^- annihilation data.

H.-W. Hammer and I recently completed a calculation of the $K\bar{K}$ contribution to r_s^2 using this technique [8]. The corresponding contribution to the integrand of Eq. (2) is plotted below. Two curves are shown in the un-physical regime ($4m_K^2 \leq t \leq 4m_N^2$). The dot-dashed curve shows the result obtained using the analytically continued K^+N amplitudes and realistic kaon strangeness form factor. The solid curve shows the same quantity computed at second order in the strong coupling, g (*i.e.*, one-loop). The latter is representative of what enters a variety of model calculations. The dashed curve in the physical region ($t \geq 4m_N^2$) results from the imposition of the unitarity bound on $b_1^{1/2, 1/2}$.

Several features in this plot are worth noting. First, the existing data for K^+N partial waves only permit an analytic continuation of the amplitudes to about $t \approx 8m_K^2$ with any reliability. However, the kaon strangeness form factor falls rapidly below unity for $t > 1.4 \text{ (GeV}/c)^2$. Consequently, any contribution to the dispersion integral for this region is negligible. Moreover, both the strangeness form factor and $b_1^{1/2, 1/2}$ display a pronounced peak near $t \approx 1 \text{ (GeV}/c)^2$, presumably arising from the $\phi(1020)$ resonance. This structure differs markedly from the content of a typical one-loop model calculation, which contains none of the resonance structure near the threshold, t_0 and violates the unitarity bound rather drastically in the physical region [7]. The latter feature reflects the absence of higher order rescattering corrections responsible for bringing the partial wave in line with the unitarity bound.

The message from the figure is that simple model calculations which involve truncations in the coupling constant (usually at second order) omit the physics which governs the various hadronic contributions to the strangeness form factors. Numerically, inclusion of these higher-order rescattering and resonance effects enhances this particular contribution ($K\bar{K}$) to r_s^2 by about a factor of three over the order g^2 prediction. Recently, Isgur and Geiger have shown that models which make another truncation – one involving the intermediate state mass – can be similarly misleading [9]. Including the full spectrum of hadronic intermediate states, at least those involving valence strange quarks, can dramatically alter the prediction obtained from just the lightest state. Although the Isgur and Geiger results were obtained from an $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ quark model calculation, their results strongly imply that realistic treatments of higher-mass intermediate states is necessary in order to obtain a physically realistic picture of the $s\bar{s}$ sea. Just what that picture

looks like, when higher order rescattering corrections, resonance effects, and higher-mass hadronic states are included, remains to be seen.

References

1. MIT-Bates proposal No. 89-06, R.D. McKeown and D.H. Beck, spokespersons (1989); MIT-Bates proposal No. 94-11, M. Pitt and E.J. Beise, spokespersons (1994); TJNAF proposal No. PR-91-017, D.H. Beck, spokesperson (1991); TJNAF proposal No. PR-91-004, E.J. Beise, spokesperson (1991); TJNAF proposal No. PR-91-010, M. Finn and P. Souder, spokespersons (1991); Mainz proposal No. A4/1-93, D. von Harrach, spokesperson (1993); Los Alamos proposal No. 1173, W.C. Louis, spokesperson.
2. P. Geiger and N. Isgur, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 1595.
3. D. B. Kaplan and A. Manohar, *Nucl. Phys.* **B310** (1988) 527.
4. K.-F. Liu, University of Kentucky Report No. UK/95-11 (1995) and references therein; D. B. Leinweber, *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 5115.
5. See Refs [30-42] of Ref. [6] below.
6. M. J. Ramsey-Musolf and H. Ito, *Phys. Rev.* **C55** (1997) 3066.
7. M. J. Musolf, H.-W. Hammer, and D. Drechsel, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 2741.
8. M. J. Ramsey-Musolf and H.-W. Hammer, INT preprint No. DOE/ER/40561-323-INT97-00-170 [hep-ph/9705409].
9. P. Geiger and N. Isgur, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 299.